

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
AIR FORCE BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

JAN 15 1999

IN THE MATTER OF:

DOCKET NUMBER: 98-00436

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
COUNSEL: None

HEARING DESIRED: No

APPLICANT REQUESTS THAT:

He be given consideration for promotion to the grade of lieutenant colonel by Special Selection Board (SSB) for the Calendar Year 1997C (CY97C) Lieutenant Colonel Board with a reaccomplished Promotion Recommendation Form (PRF), reflecting a duty title of "Lead, C-17 Flexible Sustainment Team," in his records.

APPLICANT CONTENDS THAT:

The PRF submitted for the CY97C board was unjust because it contained incorrect data in Sections III and IV. Consequently, the contested PRF did not paint an accurate picture and adversely effected his chances for promotion. He explains what happened and why he believes the original PRF warrants correction. He argues that, contrary to the Management Level Review Board (MLRB) president's statement, the senior rater tried to find out the facts and correct the error the moment he was first notified on 21 June 1997.

The applicant provides, in part, a statement from the senior rater, who support's and explains the proposed changes to the PRF. Also provided is, a statement from the MLRB president, who agrees with changing Section III but does not concur with the changes proposed for Section IV.

A copy of applicant's complete submission is attached at Exhibit A.

STATEMENT OF FACTS:

The applicant was considered but not selected for promotion to lieutenant colonel by the CY97C board, which convened on 21 July 1997.

The **contested** PRF reflects an overall promotion recommendation of "Promote." In Section III, the duty title is "Lead, C-17 Software Integration Team." The Officer Selection Brief (OSB) reviewed by the CY97C board reflected a duty tile of "Lead, C-17

Flexible Sustainment Team" (this is the title the applicant wants), effective 9 June 1997. The top Officer Performance Report (OPR), which closed on 20 April 1997, had a duty title of "Lead, C-17 International Programs Team."

The **proposed** PRF has alterations in Sections III and IV. In Section III, the duty title is "Lead, C-17 Flexible Sustainment Team" and the Key Duties, Tasks, Responsibilities block has been changed entirely. In Section IV, bullets 5, 6 and 7 have been rearranged and/or reworded. The overall promotion recommendation is still "Promote."

The Personnel Data System (PDS) at one time (at least until 10 June 1997) contained a duty history entry of "Lead, C-17 Software Integration Team," effective 21 April 1997. The PDS currently reflects a duty entry of "Lead, C-17 Flexible Sustainment Team," effective 21 April 1997.

Applicant filed a similar appeal under the provisions of AFI 36-2401. However, on 5 February 1998, the Evaluation Reports Appeal Board returned the appeal without action because the MLRB president did not fully concur.

AIR FORCE EVALUATION:

The Chief, Reports & Queries Team, HQ AFPC/DPAIS1, reviewed the case and explains why she believes the contested PRF has the duty title it does. Recommendation is deferred to AFPC/DPPPA.

A copy of the complete Air Force evaluation is at Exhibit C.

The Chief, Appeals & SSB Branch, HQ AFPC/DPPPA, also evaluated this appeal and indicates, it is apparent when the shell for the PRF was generated, it had "Lead, C-17 Software Integration Team" as the applicant's current duty title. What is not explained in the senior rater's letter is why he did not change the duty title to reflect the new title and job description to match that of the "Lead, C-17 Flexible Sustainment Team" as was his right and obligation to do. The current bullet statements in Section IV of the PRF are not erroneous and are based on all the duties he performed up until the day his PRF was written. In fact, one of the bullet statements applicant wants inserted was taken from his 20 April 1995 OPR. In other words, the information was available to the senior rater at the time the PRF was prepared despite the incorrect duty title. The senior rater's letter does not even discuss why he felt the need to change [the comments in Section IV]; he only addresses the duty title and job description issue. The MLRB president stated the changes in [Section III] do not warrant the changes to [Section IV] since the desired changes are not new information that was not otherwise available to the senior rater when he originally prepared the PRF. The author does not believe the contested PRF is inaccurate and finds no clear

evidence it negatively impacted the applicant's promotion opportunity. Denial is therefore recommended.

A copy of the complete Air Force evaluation is at Exhibit D.

APPLICANT'S REVIEW OF AIR FORCE EVALUATION:

Applicant reviewed the evaluations and counters that he was never assigned or performed the duties as "Lead, C-17 Software Integration Team." This input was put into his records in error vice the job he was assigned and performed as "Lead, C-17 Flexible Sustainment Team." It is unjust that he should have to bear the burden caused by multiple administrative errors especially when he notified his superiors immediately when he found the error. He explains why the bullets in Section IV should be changed. The intent of this appeal is to correct a PRF that was written for a job he never had, that contained inaccurate information, and that did not give him credit for the job he did have. He provides two OPRs which he believes justifies replacing the PRF and giving him SSB consideration.

A copy of applicant's complete response, with attachments, is at Exhibit F.

THE BOARD CONCLUDES THAT:

1. The applicant has exhausted all remedies provided by existing law or regulations.
 2. The application was timely filed.
 3. Sufficient relevant evidence has been presented to demonstrate the existence of probable error or injustice. We noted the supporting statement from the senior rater and the partial concurrence from the MLRB president. Based on the available evidence, it appears that Section III of the contested PRF does reflect an incorrect duty title and job description. We agree that the information contained in Section IV of the revised PRF **should** have been known to the senior rater as the MLRB president indicates. However, we believe the possibility exists that the incorrect duty title may have caused the senior rater to inadvertently overlook factors he may have otherwise emphasized in Section IV. Therefore, in order to offset any possibility of an injustice, we conclude that this applicant should be given SSB consideration for the CY97C board with the reaccomplished PRF in his records.
-

THE BOARD RECOMMENDS THAT:

The pertinent military records of the Department of the Air Force relating to APPLICANT, be corrected to show that:

a. The Promotion Recommendation Form (PRF), AF Form 709, reviewed by the Calendar Year 1997C (CY97C) Lieutenant Colonel Board be declared void.

b. The attached PRF reflecting a duty title of "Lead, C-17 Flexible Sustainment Team" be inserted in his Officer Selection Folder.

It is further recommended that his records, to include the above referenced PRF, be considered for promotion to the grade of lieutenant colonel by a Special Selection Board for the CY97C Board.

The following members of the Board considered this application in Executive Session on 5 November 1998, under the provisions of AFI 36-2603:

Mr. David C. Van Gasbeck, Panel Chair
Mr. Edward H. Parker, Member
Ms. Patricia A. Vestal, Member

All members voted to correct the records, as recommended. The following documentary evidence was considered:

- Exhibit A. DD Form 149, dated 6 Feb 98, w/atchs.
- Exhibit B. Applicant's Master Personnel Records.
- Exhibit C. Letter, HQ AFPC/DPAIS1, dated 24 Mar 98.
- Exhibit D. Letter, HQ AFPC/DPPPA, dated 20 Apr 98.
- Exhibit E. Letter, AFBCMR, dated 4 May 98.
- Exhibit F. Letter, Applicant, dated 5 May 98, w/atchs.



DAVID C. VAN GASBECK
Panel Chair



DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
WASHINGTON, DC

JAN 15 1999

Office of the Assistant Secretary

AFBCMR 98-00436

MEMORANDUM FOR THE CHIEF OF STAFF

Having received and considered the recommendation of the Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records and under the authority of Section 1552, Title 10, United States Code (70A Stat 116), it is directed that:

The pertinent military records of the Department of the Air Force relating to [REDACTED] be corrected to show that:

- a. The Promotion Recommendation Form (PRF), AF Form 709, reviewed by the Calendar Year 1997C (CY97C) Lieutenant Colonel Board be, and hereby is, declared void.
- b. The attached PRF reflecting a duty title of "Lead, C-17 Flexible Sustainment Team" be inserted in his Officer Selection Folder.

It is further directed that his records, to include the above referenced PRF, be considered for promotion to the grade of lieutenant colonel by a Special Selection Board for the CY97C Board.


Director LINEBERGER
Director
Air Force Review Boards Agency

Attachment:
Reaccomplished PRF